

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/075,593	Applicant(s) HEATH ET AL.	
	Examiner TERESA E. STRZELECKA	Art Unit 1637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Teresa Strzelecka.

(3) Dirk Loeffert.

(2) Susan Shaw McBee.

(4) Nicole Uschkarath.

Date of Interview: 20 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,24 and 45.

Identification of prior art discussed: Laitinen, Fairman.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The scope of the claims was discussed with respect to Applicants' evidence of unexpected results obtained for mammalian whole cells. Further, the issue of best mode was discussed based on the lack of disclosure of the components of trademarked Puregene kit.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Teresa E Strzelecka/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637

July 20, 2009